

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 4-25 have been withdrawn with objection.

Claims 4-25 were restricted out by the Examiner. Applicants objects and requests reconsideration by the Examiner. The Examiner states, "The traversal is on the ground(s) that the application contains only 5 more dependent claims than that allowed by the basic filing fee, and examining 25 claims is not serious burden on the examiner. This is not found persuasive..." This is only one of the reasons provided as the grounds for Applicant's traversal. Arguably more important reason, which was provided as the first argument, is that the Restriction Requirement is improper since one or more generic claims exists for the alleged multiple species identified the Examiner. Independent claim 1 is broad enough to include all the alleged species identified by the Examiner so is a generic claim. For example, claim 1 reads on each of the alleged species. Similarly, each of independent claims 21 and 25 are broad enough to include the alleged species and are generic claims to the alleged species.

The Examiner indicated that Fig. 1 should be designated by a legend such as -- Prior Art--. Applicants note that the figure was described as a conventional device, not as prior art. A conventional device does not necessary have to be prior art. If the Examiner feels Fig. 1 is prior art, Applicants request the Examiner to provide evidence as to such. If so provided, Applicants would be happy to designate Fig. 1 with an appropriate legend.

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) for not including a given reference sign mentioned in the description. That is, the Examiner indicated that numeral 7(b) and corresponding n+ layer are not depicted in figures 1, 3-4, 6, and 8. Applicants note that numeral 7(b) and corresponding n+ layer are present on Fig. 5 but not on Figs. 1, 3-4, 6, and 8 since these figures represent different embodiments than that of Fig. 5. Accordingly, the drawings comply with the regulations.

The Examiner objected to claims 1-3 for being informal. That is, the Examiner stated that the phrase "An double-triggered" on claim 1 should be corrected. Applicants note that no such phrase exists in claim 1. Rather claim 1 recites, "A power device..."

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakagawa et al. Applicants traverse the rejection. Nakagawa discloses a high breakdown voltage device that is formed using dielectric isolation method. Fig. 10 shows the cathode connected to n+ layer 34, and the anode connected to p+ layer 32

Claim 1 recites, "a semiconductor substrate of first conductivity having an upper surface and a lower surface; a first electrode terminal coupled to a first conductive region provided proximate the upper surface of the substrate; a second electrode terminal coupled to a second conductive region provided proximate the lower surface of the substrate; an isolation diffusion region of second conductivity provided at a periphery of the substrate and extending from the upper surface to the lower surface of the substrate, the isolation diffusion region having a first surface corresponding to the upper surface of the substrate and a second surface corresponding to the lower surface; and a peripheral junction region of second conductivity formed at least partly within the isolation diffusion region and formed proximate the first surface of the isolation diffusion region, wherein the peripheral junction region is different than the first and second conductive regions."

Nakagawa does not disclose "the peripheral junction region." The n+ layer 34 referred by the Examiner is a conductive region connected to the cathode and is not "the peripheral junction region," as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is allowable at least for this reason.

Claim 3 recites, "...the peripheral junction region is provided to compensate the surface depletion of the isolation diffusion region." The n+ layer 34 of Nakagawa is a conductive region for the cathode. Nakagawa does not disclose a region that is provided to compensate the surface depletion of the isolation diffusion region, in the manner recited. Claim 3 is allowable. Claim 3 also depends from claim 1.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nakagawa. Applicants traverse the rejection. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is allowable at least for this reason. In addition, claim 2 recites, "wherein the peripheral junction region is a P+ region and the isolation diffusion region is a P region." The Examiner states erroneously states, "Nakagawa et al. teach in figure 2 a peripheral junction region 10 being a P+ region and the isolation

Appl. No. 10/650,451
Amdt. dated October 14, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 14, 2004

PATENT

diffusion region 7b being a P region." This is incorrect. Figure 2 of Nakagawa disclose P region for numeral 7b, not P+ region. Claim 2 is allowable for this reason as well.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Steve Y. Cho
Reg. No. 44,612

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
SYC:syc
60333200 v1